UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/010,656	12/06/2001	Cynthia Florence Dmochowski	1-1-1-1	8740

7590 11/06/2006

Lester H. Birnbaum
6308 Sauterne Drive
Macungie, PA 18062

EXAMINER	
LIU, I JUNG	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3691	

DATE MAILED: 11/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/010,656	DMOCHOWSKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Marissa Liu	3691	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *7-11* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *06 December 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. Claim 7 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 5. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

2. Claims 8, 9, 10, and 11 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claims 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seltzer et al. (Reference B on the attached PTO-892) in view of Cummings, Jr., US Patent No. 5,301,105 (Reference A on the attached PTO-892), Warady et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,067,522 (Reference C

on the attached PTO-892), and Narayanan et al., US Patent No. 2003/0046422 A1 (Reference D on the attached PTO-892).

3. As per claim 1, Seltzer et al. teaches a method for centralizing the capital expenditure approval process for expenditures by employees in the various departments of a company comprising the parts of each step of:

b) determining factors which must be considered as a prerequisite to the approval of capital expenditures (see column 3, lines 9-11, column 2, lines 46-53, and column 6, lines 45-61, claim 29, where "approve or disapprove of a proposed expenditure within the partnership based on the risk factor table" and "including key factors partners should be aware of, an authorization for expenditure" is equivalent of "determining factors which must be considered as a prerequisite to the approval of capital expenditures").

c) using the factors to determine a defined number of levels of approvals required for each capital expenditure (see column 3, lines 9-11, column 2, lines 46-53, and column 6, lines 45-61, claim 29, where "approve or disapprove of a proposed expenditure within the partnership based on the risk factor table" and "including key factors partners should be aware of, an authorization for expenditure" is equivalent of using the factors to determine a defined number of levels of approvals required for each capital expenditure).

d) creating a database for the online computer system which stores the factors to be considered (column 1, lines 40-54, column 2, lines 48-53, column 4, lines 31-54, claim1);

e) inputting into the online system information about a desired expenditure which wants to incur the expenditure, and the factors pertaining to said expenditure (column5, lines 41-67, claim 15 and column 2, lines 48-54, where "input web pages for the insertion of

updated partnership business data wherein at least one of the forms includes an add authorization of expenditure form, where the updated partnership business data is stored within said database" is equivalent of "inputting into the online system information about a desired expenditure which wants to incur the expenditure");

f) said created inputted factors with the database and generating a table of requisite approvers for said expenditure (see Fig 3, column 2, lines 46-53, column 3 lines, 12-22, and column 4, lines 38-49);

Seltzer et al. fails to teach the following parts of each step:

a) identifying a defined number of departments within the company;

b) sought by employees in each department;

d) the identification of the departments, and the requisite levels of approvals;

e) including the department

f) using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification;

g) electronically routing the inputted information to each of said requisite approvers.

Cummings, Jr. teaches the following parts of each step:

a) identifying a defined number of departments within the company (see column 8, lines 5-8 of Cummings, Jr., where "Identification 71 are made by designees such as authorized personnel within a company personnel department" is equivalent of "identifying a defined number of departments within the company");

d) the identification of the departments (see column 1, lines 20-29 and column 8, lines 5-8 of Cummings, Jr.);

e) including the department (see column 4, lines 10-14 of Cummings, Jr.);

f) using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification (see column 7, lines 41-47, 61-65 and column 8, lines 1-20 of Cummings, where "central processing system or a personal computer" is equivalent of "computer system");

Warady et al. teaches the following parts of each step:

b) determining factors which must be considered as a prerequisite to the approval of capital expenditures sought by employees in each department (see column 5, lines 42-45 and column 13, lines 8-13 of Warady, where "benefit table corresponding to a flexible spending account" is equivalent of "expenditures");

d) the requisite levels of approvals (see column 13, lines 8-13 of Warady, where "prerequisites are required to provided by the employee for approval" is equivalent of "the requisite levels of approvals");

f) generating a table of requisite approvers for said expenditure (see column 5, lines 34-49, where "table corresponding to a flexible spending" is equivalent of "table for said expenditure");

Narayanan et al. teach the following step:

g) electronically routing the inputted information to each of said requisite approvers (see page 4-5, paragraph 0047, where "routing methods are systems disclosed herein can thus enable such approval processes to be automated across a network of approving persons" is equivalent of "electronically routing to each of said requisite approvers").

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification

feature of Cummings, Jr. into the method of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification for the purpose of providing integrated service, because the feature reduces time, direct cost and indirect cost often incurred through duplication of tests, excessive paperwork (see column 2, lines 22-27 of Cummings, Jr.).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate generating a table of requisite approvers for said expenditure feature of Warady et al. into the method of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate generating a table of requisite approvers for said expenditure for the purpose of obviating one or more of the problems due to limitations, i.e. wasted time and human error by an employee providing inconsistent information, and disadvantages of the related art, because standardized forms reduce the human error (see column 2, lines 24-53 of Warady).

It would also be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate electronically routing the inputted information feature of Narayanan et al. into the method of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate using electronically routing the inputted information feature for the purpose of permitting to construct the object y dynamically downloading the associated processing information corresponding to data received from an external data source, because it enables such approval processes to be automated across a network of approving persons or systems by associating the routing slip and the approval conditions with the document (see abstract and pages 4-5, paragraph 0047 of Narayanan et al.).

4. As per claim 2, Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., and Narayanan et al. teach claim 1 described above. Cummings, Jr., further teaches the method wherein the step of identifying a defined number of departments includes the step of identifying all of the departments (see column 22, claim 56).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate using identifying department feature of Cummings, Jr. into the combined method of Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., and Narayanan et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate identifying department feature for the purpose of providing integrated service, because the feature reduces time, direct cost and indirect cost often incurred through duplication of tests, excessive paperwork (see column 2, lines 22-27).

5. As per claim 3, Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., and Narayanan et al. teach claim 1 described above. Seltzer et al. further teaches the factors which must be considered are the nature of the item to be purchased and the cost of the item (see column 3, lines 28-36, where "operating expenses" is equivalent of "cost of the item").

6. As per claim 4, Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., and Narayanan et al. et al. teach claim 1 described above. Narayanan et al. further teaches the method wherein the inputted information is routed to the requisite approvers in a sequential manner (see page 2, paragraph 0023 and page 6, claim 16, where "subsequent object router" is equivalent of "routed in a sequential manner".)

It would also be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the inputted information is routed to the requisite approvers in a sequential manner feature of Narayanan et al. into the method of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would

have been motivated to incorporate the inputted information is routed to the requisite approvers in a sequential manner feature for the purpose of permitting to construct the object y dynamically downloading the associated processing information corresponding to data received from an external data source, because it enables such approval processes to be automated across a network of approving persons or systems by associating the routing slip and the approval conditions with the document (see abstract and pages 4-5, paragraph 0047 of Narayanan et al.).

7. As per claim 5, Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., and Narayanan et al. et al. teach claim 1 described above. Seltzer et al. further teaches the method is performed by a computer system (see column 1, lines 5-11, where "computer network-based system is equivalent of "computer system" of Seltzer et al.).

8. As per claim 6, Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., and Narayanan et al. et al. teach claim 1 described above. Seltzer et al. further teaches the method is incorporated into software (see column 2, lines 18-26, where "program" is equivalent of "software").

9. As per claim 7, Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., and Narayanan et al. et al. teach claim 1 described above. Seltzer et al. further teaches the method is performed by a computer system (see column 1, lines 5-11, where "computer network-based system is equivalent of "computer system" of Seltzer et al.).

10. As per claim 8, Seltzer et al. teaches a method for centralizing the capital expenditure approval process for expenditures by employees in the various departments of a company comprising the parts of each step of:

b) determining factors which must be considered as a prerequisite to the approval of capital expenditures (see column 3, lines 9-11, column 2, lines 46-53, and column 6, lines

45-61, claim 29, where "approve or disapprove of a proposed expenditure within the partnership based on the risk factor table" and "including key factors partners should be aware of, an authorization for expenditure" is equivalent of "determining factors which must be considered as a prerequisite to the approval of capital expenditures").

c) using the factors to determine a defined number of levels of approvals required for each capital expenditure (see column 3, lines 9-11, column 2, lines 46-53, and column 6, lines 45-61, claim 29, where "approve or disapprove of a proposed expenditure within the partnership based on the risk factor table" and "including key factors partners should be aware of, an authorization for expenditure" is equivalent of using the factors to determine a defined number of levels of approvals required for each capital expenditure).

d) creating a database for the online computer system which stores the factors to be considered (column 1, lines 40-54, column 2, lines 48-53, column 4, lines 31-54, claim1);

e) inputting into the online system information about a desired expenditure which wants to incur the expenditure, and the factors pertaining to said expenditure (column5, lines 41-67, claim 15 and column 2, lines 48-54, where "input web pages for the insertion of updated partnership business data wherein at least one of the forms includes an add authorization of expenditure form, where the updated partnership business data is stored within said database" is equivalent of "inputting into the online system information about a desired expenditure which wants to incur the expenditure");

f) said created inputted factors with the database and generating a table of requisite approvers for said expenditure (see Fig 3, column 2, lines 46-53, column 3 lines, 12-22, and column 4, lines 38-49);

Seltzer et al. fails to teach the following parts of each step:

a) identifying a defined number of departments within the company;

b) sought by employees in each department;

d) the identification of the departments, and the requisite levels of approvals;

e) including the department

f) using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification;

g) electronically routing the inputted information to each of said requisite approvers.

Cummings, Jr. teaches the following parts of each step:

a) identifying a defined number of departments within the company (see column 8, lines 5-8 of Cummings, Jr., where "Identification 71 are made by designees such as authorized personnel within a company personnel department" is equivalent of "identifying a defined number of departments within the company");

d) the identification of the departments (see column 1, lines 20-29 and column 8, lines 5-8 of Cummings, Jr.);

e) including the department (see column 4, lines 10-14 of Cummings, Jr.);

f) using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification (see column 7, lines 41-47, 61-65 and column 8, lines 1-20 of Cummings, where "central processing system or a personal computer" is equivalent of "computer system");

Warady et al. teaches the following parts of each step:

b) determining factors which must be considered as a prerequisite to the approval of capital expenditures sought by employees in each department (see column 5, lines 42-45

and column 13, lines 8-13 of Warady, where "benefit table corresponding to a flexible spending account" is equivalent of "expenditures");

d) the requisite levels of approvals (see column 13, lines 8-13 of Warady, where "prerequisites are required to provided by the employee for approval" is equivalent of "the requisite levels of approvals");

f) generating a table of requisite approvers for said expenditure (see column 5, lines 34-49, where "table corresponding to a flexible spending" is equivalent of "table for said expenditure");

Narayanan et al. teach the following step:

g) electronically routing the inputted information to each of said requisite approvers (see page 4-5, paragraph 0047, where "routing methods are systems disclosed herein can thus enable such approval processes to be automated across a network of approving persons" is equivalent of "electronically routing to each of said requisite approvers").

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification feature of Cummings, Jr. into the method of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification for the purpose of providing integrated service, because the feature reduces time, direct cost and indirect cost often incurred through duplication of tests, excessive paperwork (see column 2, lines 22-27 of Cummings, Jr.).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate generating a table of requisite approvers for said expenditure feature of Warady et al.

into the method of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate generating a table of requisite approvers for said expenditure for the purpose of obviating one or more of the problems due to limitations, i.e. wasted time and human error by an employee providing inconsistent information, and disadvantages of the related art, because standardized forms reduce the human error (see column 2, lines 24-53 of Warady).

It would also be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate electronically routing the inputted information feature of Narayanan et al. into the method of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate using electronically routing the inputted information feature for the purpose of permitting to construct the object y dynamically downloading the associated processing information corresponding to data received from an external data source, because it enables such approval processes to be automated across a network of approving persons or systems by associating the routing slip and the approval conditions with the document (see abstract and pages 4-5, paragraph 0047 of Narayanan et al.).

11. As per claim 9, Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., and Narayanan et al. teach claim 8 described above. Cummings, Jr., further teaches the method wherein the step of identifying a defined number of departments includes the step of identifying all of the departments (see column 22, claim 56).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate using identifying department feature of Cummings, Jr. into the combined method of Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., and Narayanan et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate identifying department feature for the purpose of

providing integrated service, because the feature reduces time, direct cost and indirect cost often incurred through duplication of tests, excessive paperwork (see column 2, lines 22-27).

12. As per claim 10, Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., and Narayanan et al. teach claim 8 described above. Seltzer et al. further teaches the factors which must be considered are the nature of the item to be purchased and the cost of the item (see column 3, lines 28-36, where "operating expenses" is equivalent of "cost of the item").

13. As per claim 11, Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., and Narayanan et al. teach claim 8 described above. Narayanan et al. further teaches the method wherein the inputted information is routed to the requisite approvers in a sequential manner (see page 2, paragraph 0023 and page 6, claim 16, where "subsequent object router" is equivalent of "routed in a sequential manner".)

It would also be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the inputted information is routed to the requisite approvers in a sequential manner feature of Narayanan et al. into the method of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate the inputted information is routed to the requisite approvers in a sequential manner feature for the purpose of permitting to construct the object y dynamically downloading the associated processing information corresponding to data received from an external data source, because it enables such approval processes to be automated across a network of approving persons or systems by associating the routing slip and the approval conditions with the document (see abstract and pages 4-5, paragraph 0047 of Narayanan et al.). of "table for said expenditure").

14. As per claim 12, Seltzer et al. teaches computer system for centralizing the capital expenditure approval process for expenditures by employees in the various departments of a company comprising one or more computers and computer readable code embodying instructions executable by the one or more computers, the computer system comprising computer readable code devices configured to cause the one or more computers to effect the of the following parts of each step:

b) determining factors which must be considered as a prerequisite to the approval of capital expenditures (see column 3, lines 9-11, column 2, lines 46-53, and column 6, lines 45-61, claim 29, where "approve or disapprove of a proposed expenditure within the partnership based on the risk factor table" and "including key factors partners should be aware of, an authorization for expenditure" is equivalent of "determining factors which must be considered as a prerequisite to the approval of capital expenditures").

c) using the factors to determine a defined number of levels of approvals required for each capital expenditure (see column 3, lines 9-11, column 2, lines 46-53, and column 6, lines 45-61, claim 29, where "approve or disapprove of a proposed expenditure within the partnership based on the risk factor table" and "including key factors partners should be aware of, an authorization for expenditure" is equivalent of using the factors to determine a defined number of levels of approvals required for each capital expenditure).

d) creating a database for the online computer system which stores the factors to be considered (column 1, lines 40-54, column 2, lines 48-53, column 4, lines 31-54, claim1);

e) inputting into the online system information about a desired expenditure which wants to incur the expenditure, and the factors pertaining to said expenditure (column5, lines

41-67, claim 15 and column 2, lines 48-54, where "input web pages for the insertion of updated partnership business data wherein at least one of the forms includes an add authorization of expenditure form, where the updated partnership business data is stored within said database" is equivalent of "inputting into the online system information about a desired expenditure which wants to incur the expenditure");

f) said created inputted factors with the database and generating a table of requisite approvers for said expenditure (see Fig 3, column 2, lines 46-53, column 3 lines, 12-22, and column 4, lines 38-49);

Seltzer et al. fails to teach the following parts of each step:

a) identifying a defined number of departments within the company;

b) sought by employees in each department;

d) the identification of the departments, and the requisite levels of approvals;

e) including the department

f) using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification;

g) electronically routing the inputted information to each of said requisite approvers.

Cummings, Jr. teaches the following parts of each step:

a) identifying a defined number of departments within the company (see column 8, lines 5-8 of Cummings, Jr., where "Identification 71 are made by designees such as authorized personnel within a company personnel department" is equivalent of "identifying a defined number of departments within the company");

d) the identification of the departments (see column 1, lines 20-29 and column 8, lines 5-8 of Cummings, Jr.);

e) including the department (see column 4, lines 10-14 of Cummings, Jr.);

f) using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification (see column 7, lines 41-47, 61-65 and column 8, lines 1-20 of Cummings, where "central processing system or a personal computer" is equivalent of "computer system");

Warady et al. teaches the following parts of each step:

b) determining factors which must be considered as a prerequisite to the approval of capital expenditures sought by employees in each department (see column 5, lines 42-45 and column 13, lines 8-13 of Warady, where "benefit table corresponding to a flexible spending account" is equivalent of "expenditures");

d) the requisite levels of approvals (see column 13, lines 8-13 of Warady, where "prerequisites are required to provided by the employee for approval" is equivalent of "the requisite levels of approvals");

f) generating a table of requisite approvers for said expenditure (see column 5, lines 34-49, where "table corresponding to a flexible spending" is equivalent of "table for said expenditure");

Narayanan et al. teach the following step:

g) electronically routing the inputted information to each of said requisite approvers (see page 4-5, paragraph 0047, where "routing methods are systems disclosed herein can thus enable such approval processes to be automated across a network of approving persons" is equivalent of "electronically routing to each of said requisite approvers").

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification feature of Cummings, Jr. into the system of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification for the purpose of providing integrated service, because the feature reduces time, direct cost and indirect cost often incurred through duplication of tests, excessive paperwork (see column 2, lines 22-27 of Cummings, Jr.).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate generating a table of requisite approvers for said expenditure feature of Warady et al. into the system of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate generating a table of requisite approvers for said expenditure for the purpose of obviating one or more of the problems due to limitations, i.e. wasted time and human error by an employee providing inconsistent information, and disadvantages of the related art, because standardized forms reduce the human error (see column 2, lines 24-53 of Warady).

It would also be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate electronically routing the inputted information feature of Narayanan et al. into the system of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate using electronically routing the inputted information feature for the purpose of permitting to construct the object y dynamically downloading the associated processing information corresponding to data received from an external data source, because it enables such approval processes to be automated across a network of approving persons or systems by associating the

routing slip and the approval conditions with the document (see abstract and pages 4-5, paragraph 0047 of Narayanan et al.).

15. As per claim 13, Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., and Narayanan et al. teach claim 12 described above. Cummings, Jr., further teaches the system wherein the step of identifying a defined number of departments includes the step of identifying all of the departments (see column 22, claim 56).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate using identifying department feature of Cummings, Jr. into the combined system of Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., and Narayanan et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate identifying department feature for the purpose of providing integrated service, because the feature reduces time, direct cost and indirect cost often incurred through duplication of tests, excessive paperwork (see column 2, lines 22-27).

16. As per claim 14, Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., and Narayanan et al. teach claim 12 described above. Seltzer et al. further teaches the factors which must be considered are the nature of the item to be purchased and the cost of the item (see column 3, lines 28-36, where "operating expenses" is equivalent of "cost of the item").

17. As per claim 15, Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., and Narayanan et al. teach claim 12 described above. Narayanan et al. further teaches the system wherein the inputted information is routed to the requisite approvers in a sequential manner (see page 2, paragraph 0023 and page 6, claim 16, where "subsequent object router" is equivalent of "routed in a sequential manner".)

It would also be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the inputted information is routed to the requisite approvers in a sequential manner feature of Narayanan et al. into the method of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate the inputted information is routed to the requisite approvers in a sequential manner feature for the purpose of permitting to construct the object y dynamically downloading the associated processing information corresponding to data received from an external data source, because it enables such approval processes to be automated across a network of approving persons or systems by associating the routing slip and the approval conditions with the document (see abstract and pages 4-5, paragraph 0047 of Narayanan et al.). of "table for said expenditure").

18. As per claim 16, Cummings, Jr. teaches a computer data signal embodied in a transmission medium for centralizing the capital expenditure approval process for expenditures by employees in the various departments of a company, the computer data signal comprising a code segment including instructions for

a) identifying a defined number of departments within the company (see column 8, lines 5-8 of Cummings, Jr., where "Identification 71 are made by designees such as authorized personnel within a company personnel department" is equivalent of "identifying a defined number of departments within the company");

d) the identification of the departments (see column 1, lines 20-29 and column 8, lines 5-8 of Cummings, Jr.);

e) including the department (see column 4, lines 10-14 of Cummings, Jr.);

f) using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification (see column 7, lines 41-47, 61-65 and column 8, lines 1-20 of Cummings, where "central processing system or a personal computer" is equivalent of "computer system");

Warady et al. teaches the following parts of each step:

b) determining factors which must be considered as a prerequisite to the approval of capital expenditures sought by employees in each department (see column 5, lines 42-45 and column 13, lines 8-13 of Warady, where "benefit table corresponding to a flexible spending account" is equivalent of "expenditures");

d) the requisite levels of approvals (see column 13, lines 8-13 of Warady, where "prerequisites are required to provided by the employee for approval" is equivalent of "the requisite levels of approvals");

f) generating a table of requisite approvers for said expenditure (see column 5, lines 34-49, where "table corresponding to a flexible spending" is equivalent of "table for said expenditure");

Narayanan et al. teach the following step:

g) electronically routing the inputted information to each of said requisite approvers (see page 4-5, paragraph 0047, where "routing methods are systems disclosed herein can thus enable such approval processes to be automated across a network of approving persons" is equivalent of "electronically routing to each of said requisite approvers").

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification feature of Cummings, Jr. into the computer data signal of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in

the art would have been motivated to incorporate using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification for the purpose of providing integrated service, because the feature reduces time, direct cost and indirect cost often incurred through duplication of tests, excessive paperwork (see column 2, lines 22-27 of Cummings, Jr.).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate generating a table of requisite approvers for said expenditure feature of Warady et al. into the computer data signal of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate generating a table of requisite approvers for said expenditure for the purpose of obviating one or more of the problems due to limitations, i.e. wasted time and human error by an employee providing inconsistent information, and disadvantages of the related art, because standardized forms reduce the human error (see column 2, lines 24-53 of Warady).

It would also be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate electronically routing the inputted information feature of Narayanan et al. into the computer data signal of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate using electronically routing the inputted information feature for the purpose of permitting to construct the object y dynamically downloading the associated processing information corresponding to data received from an external data source, because it enables such approval processes to be automated across a network of approving persons or systems by associating the routing slip and the approval conditions with the document (see abstract and pages 4-5, paragraph 0047 of Narayanan et al.).

19. As per claim 17, Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., and Narayanan et al. teach claim 16 described above. Cummings, Jr., further teaches the computer data signal wherein the

instructions for identifying a defined number of departments includes the instructions of identifying all of the departments (see column 22, claim 56 of Cummings and column 9 and lines 45-58 of Warady et al.).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate using identifying department feature of Cummings, Jr. into the combined system of Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., and Narayanan et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate identifying department feature for the purpose of providing integrated service, because the feature reduces time, direct cost and indirect cost often incurred through duplication of tests, excessive paperwork (see column 2, lines 22-27).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the instructions feature of Warady et al. into the computer data signal of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate the instructions for the purpose of obviating one or more of the problems due to limitations, i.e. wasted time and human error by an employee providing inconsistent information, and disadvantages of the related art, because standardized forms reduce the human error (see column 2, lines 24-53 of Warady).

20. As per claim 18, Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., and Narayanan et al. teach claim 16 described above. Seltzer et al. further teaches the factors which must be considered are the nature of the item to be purchased and the cost of the item (see column 3, lines 28-36, where "operating expenses" is equivalent of "cost of the item").

21. As per claim 19, Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., and Narayanan et al. teach claim 16 described above. Narayanan et al. further teaches the computer data signal wherein the inputted information is routed to the requisite approvers in a sequential manner (see page 2,

paragraph 0023 and page 6, claim 16, where "subsequent object router" is equivalent of "routed in a sequential manner".)

It would also be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the inputted information is routed to the requisite approvers in a sequential manner feature of Narayanan et al. into the computer data signal of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate the inputted information is routed to the requisite approvers in a sequential manner feature for the purpose of permitting to construct the object y dynamically downloading the associated processing information corresponding to data received from an external data source, because it enables such approval processes to be automated across a network of approving persons or systems by associating the routing slip and the approval conditions with the document (see abstract and pages 4-5, paragraph 0047 of Narayanan et al.).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marissa Liu whose telephone number is 571-270-1370. The examiner can normally be reached on First Friday OFF.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick James Nolan can be reached on 571-270-0847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

***

MATTHEW S. GART
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600